



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/304,552	05/04/1999	PETER J. T. VAN RAVENSTEIN	PHN16.914	9833
26646	7590	04/15/2004	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			VO, TUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2004

32

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/304,552

Applicant(s)

VAN RAVENSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Tung T. Vo

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/01/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cotton et al. (US 4,640,110) in view of Herzog et al. (US 4,703,356).

Re claims 1-15, Cotton teaches an observations system (figs.1-3A and 3B) comprising:
an observation camera (20 of fig. 1);

an observation unit (27 of fig. 1) coupled to the observation camera (20 of fig. 1), and
including means (22 and 25 of fig. 1) for detecting for observation purposes a relevant event
occurring outside the observation system (21 of fig. 1);

means (29 of fig. 1) for receiving camera signals;

2

Art Unit: 2613

means (26 of fig. 1) for recording a plurality of images including an image at a time of the event (21, 42 of fig. 3A); and

means (38 of fig. 3B) for displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event; wherein the plurality of images include image preceding the event, and the sequence is displayed in PIP form (38 of fig. 1).

It is noted that Cotton does not particularly teach means for repeatedly displaying the sequence formed of plurality of images. However, Herzog teaches means (38 of fig. 1) for repeatedly displaying images (col. 5, lines 21-24).

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Cotton and Herzog as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate display means (38 of fig. 1) of Herzog into the observation system of Cotton for the same purpose of repeatedly displaying the sequence formed by the plurality of images. Doing so would provide the monitor to repeatedly display the sequence formed by the plurality of images over and over without delay at the real time as suggested by Herzog (col. 1).

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US 5,657,076) in view of Roger Christopher Quirk (GB 2 203 586 A).

Re claims 1-3 and 5-6, Tapp teaches an observations system (fig. 4) comprising:

an observation (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig. 4);

an observation unit (36 and 70 of fig. 4) coupled to the observation camera (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig. 4), and including means (12, 14, 16, and 18 of fig. 4) for detecting for observation

purposes a relevant event (col. 2, lines 45-63) occurring outside the observation system (an undesirable zones of surveillance A, B, C, and D);

means (36 and 70 of fig. 4) for receiving camera signals (CAMERA SIGNAL of fig. 4);
means (70 of fig. 4) for recording a plurality of images, in different formats called sub-sampled images, including an image at a time of the event (56 of fig. 2, e.g. event timer generates a signal for a predetermined time interval in response of the activation signal); and

means (36 of fig. 4) for displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event; wherein the plurality of images include image preceding the event, and the sequence is displayed in PIP form (PIP of fig. 4).

It is noted that Tapp does not particularly teach means for repeatedly displaying the sequence formed of plurality of images. However, Roger teaches means (screens) for repeatedly displaying images (front page (54)). Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Tapp and Roger as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Roger into the system of Tapp for repeatedly displaying images. Doing so would allow the user to see the images in real time.

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US 5,657,076) in view of Johnson (US 6,175,373) as set forth in the previous Office Action, Paper No. 20, and the discussion follows.

Re claims 1-6, Tapp discloses a security control system comprises at least one monitor (36 of fig. 1) for observing an image captured by one or more cameras (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig.1), where the monitor display multi-video sources are provided from the cameras to the monitor

Art Unit: 2613

(PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (112, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras. Tapp further teaches the observation cameras (20, 22, 24, 26) and an observation monitor unit (28, 30, 32, 34, and 36 of fig. 1) with a processor as considered controller (40 of fig. 1) and monitor (36) included PIP coupled to the observation cameras, where the observation unit further comprises means (12, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) for detecting an observation relevant event occurring outside the observation system (surveillance cameras are at remote location and capture image of the event in a field of view outside the observation system, monitor or display station; a recording means (70 of fig. 1) for recording/storing a plurality of images including an image at a time of the event ; means (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15-20). So this would suggest that multiple display formats would be in single image of full screen or a sub-sampled image as desirable.

It is noted that the PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event by Tap but the PIP is not repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by plurality of images.

However, Johnson teaches the PIP (126 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by a plurality of images from a buffer (131 of fig. 3), where the images of the sequence are provided to the display monitor repeatedly.

Since Tapp teaches that the display (36) displays the multiple display-formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance and suggests that the various changes, substitutions, and alternations can be made for the security and surveillance system (col. 4, lines 56-59); and Johnson uses the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the frame provided

from the buffer B3, wherein the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames also being repeatedly displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 3, col. 4, lines 58-67), and Johnson suggests all such extensions, modifications, rearrangements, substitutions and combinations are contemplated to be part of the disclosed system (col. 5, lines 60-64).

Therefore, taking the teachings and suggestions of Tapp and Johnson as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the PIP (126 of fig. 3) of Johnson into the display (36 of fig. 1) of Tapp for the same purpose of repeatedly displaying the sequence formed by the plurality images.

Doing so would be desirable to have a security and surveillance system that integrates with available home equipment such as a television to provide low cost and effective surveillance monitoring of the house and grounds and eliminates or reduces disadvantages and problems associated with conventional intrusion detection devices as suggested by Tapp (col. 1).

Re claims 7-9, Tap further teaches television device (36 of fig. 10) serves to display the captured image from the camera (20-26 of fig. 1) simultaneously, this is interpreted that the camera used to provide to the television device a live image of the event (col. 4, lines 13-21; the captured image within a zone has been transmitted to the television device (36 of fig. 1) of Tap), wherein the PIP as shown in the television display (36 of fig. 1) for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display formats such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event.

Re claims 13-14, Tapp further teaches the PIP of the TV (36 of fig. 4) display the live image events recorded from the recorder (70 of fig. 4), while the live image is being displayed, the recorder (70 of fig. 4) is also recording the live image.

Re claims 10-12, the combination of Tapp and Johnson further discloses wherein the plurality images (frames) includes images preceding the event (first, second and third frame), wherein the sequence is displayed in PIP form, and where in the case of multiple events, a sequence including a latest of the multiple events is repeatedly displayed (126 of fig. 3; col. 4, lines 47-52) as suggested by Johnson. Johnson further teaches the contents of buffer B3 are repeatedly displayed to the display monitor, which is interpreted as the frame of the occurrence events is repeated displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 1, see also col. 4, lines 57-65).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 04/01/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that the Johnson discloses only one of the video data portion in the buffer is selectively display to provide live video on a computer system. Thus Johnson is directed to addressing an entirely different problem than is addressed by presently claimed subject matter in which a sequence formed by a plurality of image is display upon occurrence on the event. Accordingly, a person having ordinary skill would not motivated to combine the references (Johnson and Tapp) to provide the presently claimed subject matter, pages 6 and 7 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tapp teaches the television monitor (36 of fig. 1) that displays multi-video sources that are provided from the cameras as the PIP monitor (PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (112, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras, wherein the monitor display (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15-20), this suggests that multiple display formats would be in single image of full screen or a sub-sampled image as desirable.

Johnson teaches the PIP (126 and 131 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying the portion, first complete frame, second complete frame, and third complete frame, from a buffer (col. 6, lines 39-63), wherein the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames (images), first, second, third complete frames.

Since Tapp suggests that the display (36) displays the multiple display-formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance and suggests the various changes, substitutions, and alternations can be made for the security and surveillance system (col. 4, lines 56-59; where Johnson uses the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the frame provided from the buffer B3 and the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames also being repeatedly displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 3, col. 4, lines 58-67) and suggests all such extensions, modifications, rearrangements, substitutions and combinations are contemplated to be part of the disclosed system (col. 5, lines 60-64). Therefore, one skill in the art would combine Tapp and Johnson to make obvious the claimed invention. In view of the discussion above, the claimed features are unpatentable over Tapp, Johnson, and combination of Tapp and Johnson.

In further response to applicant's argument, page 5 of the remarks, that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Tapp and Johnson both suggest the monitor to display the image signal captured from the camera.

The obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F. 2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCAP 1969).

The applicant further pointed out that the “*prima facie*” of the remarks have been considered, but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the previous Office Action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-5874. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2613

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris. Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TUNG T. VO
PATENT EXAMINER

T.Vo

Tung T. Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2613